



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,877	02/19/2004	Peter Kochersperger	1857.2140000	1990
26111 7590 10/01/2009 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER DUONG, KHANH B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2822				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/01/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/780,877

Applicant(s)

KOCHERSPERGER, PETER

Examiner

KHANH B. DUONG

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 14, 15 and 23-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 14, 15 and 23-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 6, 2009 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to the amendment filed July 6, 2009.

Accordingly, claims 12 and 23 were amended, and new claims 24-29 were added. Claims 1-11, 13, 16-22 were previously canceled.

Claim 15 remains withdrawn from further consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

Currently, claims 12, 14, 15 and 23-29 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended and new claims have been considered and are addressed in the following ground(s) of rejection under Getchel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,375,176).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 12, 14, 23, 24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Getchel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,375,176).

Re claim 12, Getchel et al. ("Getchel") expressly discloses in FIG.'s 9A and 11A wafer holder structure comprising: (a) a wafer chuck 533 (of cast aluminum); and (b) an "expandable" annular tube 580 coupled to the wafer chuck 533. Since the wafer holder structure recited by Getchel is substantially identical to that of the claim, it is inherent that the wafer chuck 533 is configured to receive a wafer, and the expandable annular tube 580 is configured to expand the wafer chuck 533 without substantially expanding the wafer, such that an inherent initial stress at an interface between the wafer and the wafer chuck 533 is created. See *MPEP 2112.01*.

In reference to the recitation "[a] lithography system configured to reduce wafer slipping", such limitation has not been given patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble is denied the effect of a limitation where the claim following the preamble is a self-contained description of the structure not depending for completeness upon the introductory clause. *Kropa v. Robie*, 88USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951).

In addition, in reference to the claim language referring to the functions of the device, i.e., "configured to receive a wafer" and "configured to expand the wafer chuck without substantially expanding the wafer, such that an inherent initial stress at an interface between the wafer and the wafer chuck is created", intended use and other types of functional language must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, and then it meets the claim. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235

(CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); *Ex parte Masham*, 2USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). In the instant case and as explained above, Getchel shows all structural limitations specifically recited in the claim and it appears that the recited functional limitation does not affect the structure of Getchel. Furthermore, labels statements of intended use, or functional language do not structurally distinguish claims over prior art, which can function in the same manner, be labeled in the same manner, or be used in the same manner. See *MPEP 2112.01*.

Re claim 14, Getchel expressly discloses in the same figures said annular tube 580 is coupled to an outer edge of said wafer chuck 533.

Re claim 23, in reference to the claim language referring to the functions or intended use of the device, i.e., “configured to expand said wafer chuck in a uniform manner”, see discussion above regarding claim 12.

Re claim 24, since Getchel expressly discloses in FIG. 11A the use of the annular tube 580 as a heat sink, it is inherent that the annular tube 580 comprises a metal which is a material for effective heat transfer.

Re claim 26, Getchel discloses said annular tube 580 includes a cavity, and wherein the cavity is configured to be filled with one of a fluid (e.g. liquid) [see col. 17, lines 61-65].

Re claim 27, Getchel discloses a temperature sensor coupled to the wafer chuck [see col. 7, lines 19-24].

Re claim 28, in reference to the claim language referring to the functions or intended use of the device, i.e., “configured to releasably secure or hold the wafer by vacuum clamping”, see discussion above regarding claim 12.

Re claim 29, in reference to the claim language referring to the functions or intended use of the device, i.e., “configured to releasably secure or hold the wafer by electrostatic clamping”, see discussion above regarding claim 12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Getchel.

Re claim 25, Getchel does not disclose the annular tube 580 comprises a plastic.

It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use plastic for the annular tube, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sogard (U.S. 6,734,117), Tsuchihashi (U.S. 6,416,618) and Kochersperger (U.S. 7,542,263) disclose relevant systems for reducing wafer slipping.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KHANH B. DUONG whose telephone number is (571) 272-1836. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zandra Smith, can be reached on (571) 272-2429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/K. B. D./

/Zandra V. Smith/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2822